

**1. World Heritage Property Data**

**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries

**Comment**

The corrected name as indicated in the nomination document is Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries.

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**

**State(s) Party(ies)**

- Thailand

**Type of Property**

natural

**Identification Number**

591

**Year of inscription on the World Heritage List**

1991


**1.3 - Geographic Information Table**

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries	15.333 / 98.917	577464	0	577464	1991
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>577464</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>577464</b>	

**Comment**

The area was expanded by the Royal Decree of the Thai Government in 1992. The area added to the world heritage property is 45,270 ha. Therefore, the current total property area of Thung Yai - Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries is 642,734 ha. They are not affecting the Outstanding Universal Value. The Thai government considers this as a minor modification and has reported the new boundaries in the earlier periodic reports.

**1.4 - Map(s)**

Title	Date	Link to source
Map of the Royal Decree	28/09/1990	

**Comment**

The Thai government would like the Committee to consider for a minor modification if it is not done. The modified map of the property is attached. This extension has been effective in Thai laws since 1992. The reason for the extension is to include good natural areas into the property. This act has added value to the property as a world heritage site. There is no country boundary conflicts from this extension. Also the Thai government has used the new map in the earlier periodic reports.

**1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property**

**Comment**

Department of National Parks ,Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP) of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE).

**1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency**

- The Director  
Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries Natural World Heritage Office

**Comment**

The corrected name is Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries Natural World Heritage Office .

**1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)**

1. [1001wonders.org](http://1001wonders.org) : visit this site in panophotographies - 360 x 180 degree images
2. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
3. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

**Comment**

Thai world heritage information center:  
http://www.thaiwhc.go.th/resource.aspx  
http://www.onep.go.th/whc/

**1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)**

**2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

**2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

**Comment**

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the Worldheritage Headquarter to be reviewed by the relevant Advisory Body and approved by the World Heritage Committee.

**2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed**

(vii)(ix)(x)

**2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion**

Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion was described in the SOUV in 2.1.

**2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised**

-

**2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

-

**3. Factors Affecting the Property**

**3.14. Other factor(s)**

**3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

-

### 3.15. Factors Summary Table

#### 3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources						
3.5.3 Land conversion						
3.5.4 Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals						
3.5.5 Crop production						
3.5.6 Commercial wild plant collection						
3.5.7 Subsistence wild plant collection						
3.5.8 Commercial hunting						
3.5.9 Subsistence hunting						
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.3 Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting						
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
3.9.1 Illegal activities						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)						
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>					
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.1 Low impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.3 Management activities						
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside

### 3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

#### 3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>				
3.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.5.3 Land conversion	localised	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.5.4 Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5.5 Crop production	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5.6 Commercial wild plant collection	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.5.7 Subsistence wild plant collection	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	increasing
3.5.8 Commercial hunting	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.5.9 Subsistence hunting	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>				
3.8.3 Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting	restricted	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>				
3.9.1 Illegal activities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>				
3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)	localised	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>				
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	low capacity	increasing

### 3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

1. Illegal activities responded to section 3.9.1 is limited to illegal poaching. 2. Invasive/alien terrestrial species responded to section 3.12.2 is limited to weed. The origin of this invasive species originated from outside, e.g., the area or water resources near the villages or the buffer zone. 3. Low impact research/monitoring activities responded to section 3.13.1 is mainly related to research projects at the WH site. The long term monitoring project on tiger, for example, has long been conducted by the Thai researchers with funding support from the Thai government, WCS, and US Fish and Wildlife Service

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

#### 4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Although the WH property has no buffer zone specified during the inscription, the Thai government has applied the buffer zone concept to manage the areas outside the property, i.e., the eastern edge, for several years. The areas in the north and south of the property have also been used as the good buffers.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

### 4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

#### Comment

The WH property has been protected as the wildlife sanctuary since 1972 under the National Wildlife Reservation and Protection Act AD 1960 (1992 Amendment).

### 4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

### 4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

### 4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

### 4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

### 4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

-

## 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

### 4.3.1 - Management System

Both sanctuaries are under the administrative authority of the Royal Forest Department's Wildlife Conservation Division. Management plans have been prepared by a team from Kasetsart University for both sides, and these have been discussed and approved by the Royal Forest Department's Management Plan Committee (ONEB, 1990).

#### Comment

Both sanctuaries are under the administrative authority of the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation. The active years of the Master Plan for Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary were from 1980 - 1994.

Despite no new Master Plan existing, the sanctuaries have to prepare the budget plan every year. Part of the current management system of the WH property follows the Living Landscape Conceptual Model.

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

Besides the Master Plan, there have been different management documents for the WH property. Another important document is the Western Forest Complex Ecosystem Management Project (2000-2004). And then the Living Landscape Conceptual Model and Report (2005-2015) is being used as guidance for management of the WH property. Another key document is "National Tiger Action Plan 2010 - 2012" that specifies activities necessary to restore tigers in the World Heritage site.

**4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?**

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

**4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?**

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

**4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?**

**No annual work / action plan** exists

**4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following**

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Not applicable
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

**4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

**4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and /**

**or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

**4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?**

There is **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

**4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

Although there is no annual plan, the routine activities are specified in the annual budget plan. Besides, the key conservation interventions have been closely monitored with a very good monitoring system under the Spatial Management Information System (MIST) and tiger and wildlife population monitoring systems.

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**



-

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

**4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)**

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	5%
Governmental (National / Federal)	91%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	1%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	2.5%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0.5%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

**4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)**

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
N, Incendie Thung Yai Huai Kha Kheng	1995	30000.00	
Reviewing fire management policy in the conservation of the Thung Yai and Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries and WH area of Thailand	1998	20000.00	
<b>Total</b>		50000	

**4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?**

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

**4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?**

The existing sources of funding are **secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

**4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?**

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

**4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?**

There are **some** equipment and facilities but overall these are **inadequate**

**4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?**

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

**4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure**

More than 90% of the budget to manage the WH property is from the government budget. The budget is quite secure. Although there has been up and down in the budget allocations the basic activities have been maintained. The budgets from NGOs are less secure. The major current NGO support is from the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) on strengthening protection and monitoring system in the WH property.

**4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

**4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Permanent	40%
Seasonal	60%

**4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

**4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?**

Human resources are **inadequate** for management needs

**4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Poor
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

**4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Low
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

**No capacity** development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

**4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

The park rangers and officers protection the WH property have been well trained, and they are using the high standard called MIST-based Smart Patrol System. The wildlife monitoring teams have good expertise in conducting the high standard population and ecological monitoring for tigers and their prey. The trainings of sanctuary staff have been in close collaboration with WCS to improve their performance and effectiveness to take care of the WH property.

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

**4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

**4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management**



**needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

**4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report**

Saksit Simcharoen, Anak Pattanavibool, K. Ullas Karanth, James D. Nichols and N. Samba Kumar. How many tigers Panthera tigris are there in Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary, Thailand? An estimate using photographic capture-recapture sampling. Oryx ,Vol 41, No. 4 ,October 2007

**4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects**

The space provided above for the details of publications is not enough to input related information. There are several published scientific studies and research work regarding the WH property. The most important document with impacts to the property management is about tiger and prey population studies that have been strongly linked with protection and management effectiveness.

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

**4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?**

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

**4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups**

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Poor
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

**4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?**

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

**4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?**

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

**4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?**

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

**4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property**

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Poor

**4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building**

The new exhibition center at Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary has been opened. This center is equipped with high quality exhibitions regarding the WH property values, and the way the public could help to conserve the property. The cost to build the exhibitions was from the Thai Petroleum Company: Exploration and Production (PTT-EP).

**4.7. Visitor Management**

**4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years**

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Major Increase (100%+)

**4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?**

Entry tickets and registries
------------------------------

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation has a management plan to open 3 locations in Huai Kha Khaeng and 3 locations in Thung Yai Wildlife Sanctuaries for ecotourism. The Department also provides budget for organizing the visitor center and nature trails. The plan is not to promote mass tourism in the WH property but to promote wildlife-based ecotourism to strengthen conservation efforts.

**4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

**4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?**

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters

**4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?**

The fee is collected, and makes some contribution to the management of the World Heritage property

**4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property**

The WH property is the wildlife sanctuary, where in Thailand mass tourism cannot be promoted at the site. Therefore, there are no industrial tourism activities. However, the government is planning to promote the site using "wildlife-based ecotourism." The areas opened for this ecotourism activities will be limited and impacts will be controlled.

**4.8. Monitoring**

**4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?**

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

**4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups**

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Excellent
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Poor

**4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?**

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

**4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee**

-

**4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring**

Since 2006 the WH property has used the Spatial Management Information System (MIST) as the main tool to run the protection and management of the area. The data are collected by the patrol teams and input into the MIST database at the headquarters of the sanctuaries. The system to monitor tigers and their prey has been in place and run regularly in the last 6 years.

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

#### 5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>						
<b>3.5.3</b>	<b>Land conversion</b>						
<b>3.5.4</b>	<b>Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals</b>	Criteria affected are VII, IX, and X. Attributes affected are wildlife and forest.	Actions include 1) Controlling the spreading of livestock outside and inside the WH property, 2) Fencing the part of WH property, 3) Finding the alternative incomes for local people.	Monitoring includes 1) Population monitoring of livestock outside and inside the WH property., 2) Disease monitoring for livestock and wildlife in the contact zone. 3) Monitoring of habitat change.	As long as the problem still exists.	Agencies involved include 1) Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation. 2) Livestock Department, 3) Veterinary Science schools in key universities.	The target areas include the villages on the eastern edge of Huai Kha Khaeng and the Karen villages inside Thung Yai East and West Wildlife Sanctuaries.
<b>3.5.6</b>	<b>Commercial wild plant collection</b>	Criteria affected include VII, IX, and X.	Actions include: (1) enforcement; and (2) promoting alternative livelihood for villagers living outside the park.	Monitoring includes: (1) monitoring an amount of bamboo shoots and mushrooms taken out from the WH; (2) monitoring a numbers of people and sources of people coming to collect wild plants for commercial purpose; and (3) monitoring impacts on wildlife and forests.	As long as the problem exists.	Agencies involved are: (1) the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP); (2) Royal Forest Department; (3) local communities; and (4) district authorities.	Mushrooms, bamboo shoots, and agar wood are the main wildlife plants collected from the property site for commercial purposes. Despite good cooperation between the government side and local authorities, the trend in the last 6 year has still been increased.
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
<b>3.8.3</b>	<b>Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting</b>						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>						
<b>3.11.6</b>	<b>Fire (wildfires)</b>	Criteria affected include VII, IX, X	Actions include: (1) intensive fire suppression in the WH site; (2) controlled burn in some areas; (3) awareness campaigns with communities on negative impacts of fires; and (4) promoting use of fires for maintaining open forests for ungulates.	Monitoring includes: (1) monitoring amount of areas burned by fires using satellite images; (2) monitoring the spots of fires by fire crew during dry season; and (3) monitoring habitat change by fires and fire suppression and impacts to ungulate	As long as the problem exists.	Agencies involved are: (1) the Department of National Parks; Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP); (2) Royal Forest Department; (3) Kasetsart University; (4) local communities; and (5) district authorities.	Forest fires in the WH property used to be severity damages in the dry season. Forest fires are mainly anthropogenic causes. Since the government has invested lots of budget and resources to fight forest fires, the situation now is under control and stable..
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>						
<b>3.12.2</b>	<b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>						

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
<b>4.3.10</b>	<b>There is little or no contact with industry regarding management</b>	Despite no activities of big industry in or nearby the WH property, enforcement by regularly patrolling has been applied, especially the border between Thai and Myanmar.	Continue to patrol the border between Thai and Myanmar.	Agencies involved are: (1) the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP); (2) Border Petrol Police; and (3) Army.	There is no big industry in or nearby the WH property. The whole area is the protected areas.	
<b>4.7 Visitor Management</b>						



4.7.4	<b>Some management of visitor use of the property but this could be improved</b>	Actions include: (1) zoning the areas to pilot projects on ecotourism at 6 locations of the WH site; (2) improving nature education areas at the zoning site as necessary; (3) develop nature interpretation system and interpreters for implementation of the pilot sites; and (4) formulate the visitor management plan for WH management.	As long as the visitor management plan accomplishes.	Agencies involved are: (1) the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP); (2) provincial tourism office; and (3) local communities.	The Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation has a plan for pilot projects on ecotourism to 6 locations at the zoning areas of the WH site: 3 locations in Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary and the other 3 in Tung Yai Wildlife Sanctuary. The plan is to promote wildlife-based ecotourism to strengthen conservation efforts not to promote mass tourism in the world heritage property.
4.7.5	<b>Contact with the tourism industry is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters</b>	Actions include: (1) coordinate with government and private sectors, including provincial, district, and local communities to inform the laws and regulations related to using the designated areas for nature education and wildlife-based ecotourism; and (2) public relation on nature conservation and value of the WH property.	As long as the nature education center and wildlife-based ecotourism pilot projects run.	Agencies involved are: (1) the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP); (2) Tourism Authority of Thailand; (3) private sectors; (4) provincial tourism offices; and (5) local communities.	Thailand by Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation does not have any policy to promote mass tourism in the WH site.

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

**5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value**

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

**5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.4.1 - Comments**

The WH property is protected under the strongest status in Thailand which is wildlife sanctuary. Many ranger stations and park rangers are in place. However, the threats originated from villages inside and outside the WH property have been gradually degrading the WH property in various ways. Wildlife is the first and most impacted by poaching. The habitat is gradually changed by degradation.

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

**6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas**

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

**6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status**

The WH status has given the property highly recognized among the Thai and international communities.

**6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report**

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Non Governmental Organization
External experts
Advisory bodies

**6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?**

no

**6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire**

There are some flaws in the questionnaire. The guided questions sometimes do not suit the real situations. They are hard to answer sometime. We feel that we have to choose the answers with questions in mind and less confidence. The automatic selections of the top 6 items in threats are not perfect and it did select the wrong priority. The comment boxes have very limited space to fill in information.

**6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities**

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

**6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?**

Most of the required information was accessible

**6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following**

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

**6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities**

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

**6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee****• Name of World Heritage Property**

Reason for update: The corrected name as indicated in the nomination document is Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries.

**• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

Reason for update: Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the World Heritage Headquarter to be reviewed by the relevant Advisory Body and approved by the World Heritage Committee.

**• Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: The area was expanded by the Royal Decree of the Thai Government in 1992. The area added to the world heritage property is 45,270 ha. Therefore, the current total property area of Thung Yai - Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries is 642,734 ha. They are not affecting the Outstanding Universal Value. The Thai government considers this as a minor modification and has reported the new boundaries in the earlier periodic reports.

**• Map(s)**

Reason for update: The Thai government would like the Committee to consider for a minor modification if it is not done. The modified map of the property is attached. This extension has been effective in Thai laws since 1992. The reason for the extension is to include good natural areas into the property. This act has added value to the property as a world heritage site. There is no country boundary conflicts from this extension. Also the Thai government has used the new map in the earlier periodic reports.

**6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise**

The subjects of management quality and conditions of the property should be seriously monitored by UNESCO also. It is not good just to keep giving new areas the WH status without any good system to monitor what have happened to the listed properties. It is not enough to leave the management qualities to the state party.